

REMARKS

The present application was filed on March 19, 2004 with claims 1-25.

In the outstanding Office Action dated September 21, 2007, the Examiner: (i) rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter; (ii) rejected claims 1, 5-7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,449,647 (hereinafter "Colby"); (iii) rejected claims 2-4, 18-20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,221 to (hereinafter "Bender"); (iv) rejected claims 8 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,156 (hereinafter "Veres") and U.S. Patent No. 6,981,029 to (hereinafter "Menditto"); (v) rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby; (vi) rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby in view of Veres and Menditto as applied to claim 11 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,211 (hereinafter "Lu"); (vii) rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby and Bender in further view of Veres and Menditto; and (viii) rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Colby, Bender, Veres and Menditto in further view of Lu.

In this response, Applicants amend claims 1 and 17, and respectfully traverse the various rejections for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the objection to claims 1 and 17 and the §101 rejection of claim 17, Applicants have amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection and §101 rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the §102(b) rejection, Applicants initially note that MPEP §2131 specifies that a given claim is anticipated "only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, MPEP §2131 indicates that the cited reference must show the "identical invention . . . in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim," citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) rejection on the ground that the Colby reference fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 5-7

and 14-17 as alleged.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of processing a request to at least one server, comprising the steps of: receiving the request; and scheduling submission of the request to the at least one server based on: (i) a quality-of-service (QoS) class assigned to a client from which the request originated; (ii) a response target associated with the QoS class; and (iii) an estimated response time associated with the at least one server.

The Examiner in formulating the §102(b) rejection of claim 1 argues that each and every one of the above-noted limitations of claim 1 is anticipated by the teachings of Colby. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In characterizing the Colby reference as disclosing a quality-of-service (QoS) class assigned to a client from which the request originated, the Examiner refers to column 2, lines 58-61 of Colby. The only reference to QoS is that the QoS requirements are implied by the content request. In fact, no where does Colby disclose assigning a QoS class to a client.

Accordingly, it is believed that the teachings of Colby fail to meet the limitations of claim 1.

Independent claims 14 and 17 include limitations similar to those of claim 1, and are therefore believed allowable for reasons similar to those described above with reference to claim 1.

Dependent claims 5-7, 15 and 16 are allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to claims 1 and 14. One or more of these claims are also believed to define separately-patentable subject matter over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 5-7 and 14-17 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the §103(a) rejections, Applicants initially note that a proper case of obviousness requires that the cited references when combined must "teach or suggest all the claim limitations," and that there be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references or to modify the reference teachings. See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Eighth Edition, August 2001, §706.02(j).

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a proper case of obviousness in the §103(a) rejection of claims 2-4, 18-20 and 25 over Colby and Bender, in that the Colby and Bender

references, even if assumed to be combinable, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, and in that no cogent motivation has been identified for combining the references or modifying the reference teachings to reach the claimed invention.

Claim 18 is directed to a method of processing requests to at least one server, comprising the steps of: assigning at least one client to a quality-of-service (QoS) class from among at least two QoS classes; assigning a response target to at least one QoS class; estimating at least one response time of the at least one server based on one or more requests sent to the server within a given time period; and withholding requests associated with a first one of the at least two QoS classes to allow requests associated with a second one of the at least two QoS classes to meet its response target based on the at least one estimated response time.

The Examiner in formulating the §103(a) rejection of claim 18 argues that each and every one of the above-noted limitations is met by the collective teachings of Colby and Bender. Below, Applicants explain how such portions of Colby and Bender fail to teach or suggest what the Examiner contends that they teach or suggest. While Applicants may refer from time to time to each reference alone in describing its deficiencies, it is to be understood that such arguments are intended to point out the overall deficiency of the cited combination.

The Colby reference does not disclose assigning at least one client to a quality-of-service (QoS) class from among at least two QoS classes, as noted above with regard to claim 1. Bender fails to supplement the above-noted deficiencies.

Accordingly, it is believed that the teachings of Colby and Bender fail to meet the limitations of claim 18.

Independent claim 25 includes limitations similar to those of claim 18, and is therefore believed allowable for reasons similar to those described above with reference to claim 18.

Dependent claims 2-4, 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to claims 1 and 18. One or more of these claims are also believed to define separately-patentable subject matter over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 2-4, 18-20 and 25 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 2-4, no where does Colby teach or suggest withholding the request from submission to the at least one server when the request originated from a client assigned to a first QoS class to allow a request that originated from a client assigned to a second QoS class to meet a response target associated therewith (as recited in claim 2), determining a throughput of the at least one server; and reducing a request withhold rate to increase throughput of the at least one server (as recited in claim 3), and monitoring a throughput of the at least one server; and varying a request withhold rate to balance the throughput and request response times (as recited in claim 4).

Regarding the claims 8 and 10-12 which depend from independent claim 1, Applicants assert that such claims are patentable not only due to their respective dependence on claim 1, but also because such claims recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Also, Veres and Menditto fail to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Colby.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-25 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §101, §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 39,274  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-2946

Date: December 21, 2007